

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/484,260 ; 10/005,704	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GIPSON, THOMAS C.	
	<b>Examiner</b> George Suchfield	<b>Art Unit</b> 3676	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** pending

 (1) George Suchfield.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Michael S. McCoy.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 5 January 2006
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

4

Prior art documents discussed:

None

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 \_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was observed by the examiner that in line 11 of claim 4, the term "wherein" from the original patent claim was repeated, and thus, deleted twice, with the second occurrence deemed extraneous. It was further noted that the reissue declaration, although otherwise acceptable, was now deemed "stale", i.e., the date of execution of the declaration of June 20, 2005, is deemed too far removed from the September 9, 2005 submission date of the actual amendment after final. Also, a review of the record indicated that, at some point during the prosecution, claim 9 had been inadvertently cancelled by the Office; applicant was requested to submit a clean copy of claim 9 to complete the record. Applicant will submit a supplemental amendment/response to correct these deficiencies so the case can pass for issue.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/484,260 ; 90/005,708	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GIPSON, THOMAS C.	
	<b>Examiner</b> George Suchfield	<b>Art Unit</b> 3676	

**All Participants:**

(1) George Suchfield.

(2) Michael S. McCoy.
**Status of Application:** pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 20 May 2005
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**
**Rejection(s) discussed:**

None

**Claims discussed:**

4

**Prior art documents discussed:**

None

**Part II.**
**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**
*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

90/005,508

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was observed by the examiner that in line 11 of claim 4, the phrase "injecting position" was repeated, with the second occurrence deemed extraneous. It was further noted that the reissue declaration was deficient in failing to set forth at least one error to support a "broadening" reissue, i.e., the deletion of one or more features from the original patent claim 4, such as the mast. Applicant was invited to correct these deficiencies through the submission of a supplemental response; otherwise a final action would ensue.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/484,260 ; 90/005,704	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GIPSON, THOMAS C.	
	<b>Examiner</b> George Suchfield	<b>Art Unit</b> 3676	

**All Participants:**

(1) George Suchfield.

(2) Michael S. McCoy.

**Status of Application:** pending

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 10 February, 2006

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*None*

**Claims discussed:**

*4, 5 and 9*

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*None*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was observed by the examiner that in applicant's supplemental response dated January 26, 2006, claim 4 had been improperly amended, as per reissue practice, in striking through the deleted text, which must be provided with brackets, instead. Also, claims 5 and 9 were improperly amended by providing double brackets. Applicant will provide an additional supplemental amendment wherein the deleted text of claim 4 will be indicated with brackets, rather than strikethroughs, and claims 5 and 9 will be amended to replace the double brackets with single brackets.